

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 are presently pending. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 are cancelled without prejudice. Claim 9 is added. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 were rejected.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshioka. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious form the combination of Yoshioka in view of Uchida.

Claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations "writing a matrix of luminance pixels to a first portion of the memory; writing a first matrix of chrominance pixels to a second portion of the memory; writing a second matrix of chrominance pixels to a third portion of the memory; and the first portion, second portion, and third portion being contiguous".

Assignee respectfully submits that the combination of Yoshioka and Uchida do not teach the foregoing. Examiner has indicated that Uchida teaches "as shown in fig. 11, the DCT blocks of luminance Y matrix are stored in the respective memory areas assigned to e.g., first portion of memory", "as shown in fig. 11, the DCT blocks of the color difference R-Y, e.g., first chrominance matrix (Cr) stored in the respective memory area assigned thereto, e.g., second portion of memory" and "as shown in fig. 11, the DCT blocks of second chrominance matrix B-Y (Cb) written/stored in the respective memory area assigned thereto, e.g., third portion of the memory".

However, claim 1 as now amended recites, "writing a matrix of luminance pixels to a first portion of the memory; writing a first matrix of chrominance pixels to a second portion of the memory; writing a second matrix of

chrominance pixels to a third portion of the memory; and the first portion, second portion, and third portion being contiguous". Assignee respectfully submits that "pixels" do not read on DCT (discrete cosine transformation) blocks.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, as well as to dependent claim 9.

Additionally, claim 9 is added. Notwithstanding claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, Assignee respectfully submits that claim 9 should be allowed because neither reference teaches "wherein the second portion and the third portion form portions of a plurality of data words." Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests allowance for claim 9.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: February 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100